

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

KRISTA JONES,

Plaintiff,

CASE No. 2:19-cv-255

v.

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

INTERLAKE STEAMSHIP CO., et al.,

Defendants.

_____ /

**ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Vermaat’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 171); Plaintiff’s Objections (ECF Nos. 172 and 174); Defendant’s Response (ECF No. 175) and Plaintiff’s Reply. (ECF No. 176). Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, where, as here, a party has objected to portions of a Report and Recommendation, “[t]he district judge . . . has a duty to reject the magistrate judge’s recommendation unless, on de novo reconsideration, he or she finds it justified.” 12 WRIGHT, MILLER, & MARCUS, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 3070.2, at 381 (2d ed. 1997). Specifically, the Rules provide that:

The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

FED R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). De novo review in these circumstances requires at least a review of the evidence before the Magistrate Judge. *Hill v. Duriron Co.*, 656 F.2d 1208, 1215 (6th Cir. 1981). The Court has reviewed de novo the claims and evidence presented to the Magistrate Judge; the

Report and Recommendation itself; and Plaintiff's objections. After its review, the Court finds the Report and Recommendation is factually sound and legally correct.

The Magistrate Judge recommends granting the defense motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 167) and dismissing this case. In the objections, Plaintiff primarily reiterates and expands upon arguments presented in her original response brief. Her objections fail to deal in a meaningful way with the Magistrate Judge's analysis. The Magistrate Judge carefully and thoroughly considered the record, the parties' arguments, and the governing law. The Magistrate Judge properly analyzed Plaintiff's claims. Nothing in Plaintiff's Objections changes the fundamental analysis.

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 171) is **APPROVED AND ADOPTED** as the Opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Objections (ECF No. 172 and 174) are **OVERRULED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the defense motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 167) is **GRANTED**. This case is **DISMISSED**.

Dated: May 14, 2024

/s/ Robert J. Jonker
ROBERT J. JONKER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE